



**US Army Corps  
of Engineers®**

HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
OFFICE OF DEPUTY COMMANDING GENERAL FOR CIVIL WORKS AND  
OFFICE OF DEPUTY COMMANDING GENERAL FOR MILITARY PROGRAMS

# PROGRAMS MANAGEMENT NEWS

VOLUME II ISSUE 4

NOV / DEC 1999

This Publication Is Issued On A Bi-Monthly Basis.

## STEVE'S NOTE

Seasons Greetings, Colleagues!

As 1999 draws to a close, I look to the new millennium with great optimism. The Programs and Project Management Business Process is taking hold. We've achieved much to be proud of.

I am confident that the Corps will continue to build a bright future for our clients and our nation as a whole. A few initiatives that we are working include changing the way we think of Quality - From our historical definition based on technical merit to focusing on satisfying our customer. The Program and Project Management Information System Phase 2 is underway to improve support across the Corps. Many new opportunities await us in 2000 and beyond, and each of you has the opportunity to be part of it.

Happy Holidays!

Steve

Stephen Browning, P.E.  
Chief, Programs Management Division  
Office of Deputy Commanding General  
for Military Programs **S**

## FRED'S NOTE

Those of you who know me well can attest that I'm not given to hyperbole, so I ask that you take me seriously when I assert that we have an opportunity right now in the Civil Works program that's greater than any I've seen in over 30 years in the Corps. Based on some visionary direction and guidance offered by the Chief in a number of recent forums - most notably at the Senior Leaders Conference in San Francisco last August - and proactively supported by the ASA(CW), we are reversing a many-year policy which prevented the Corps from being an effective Federal advocate for water resources infrastructure and management.

I believe there is compelling evidence that this nation has under-invested in its water resources needs for at least two decades and that there will be serious adverse impacts in the future as a result. This under-investment can be characterized in three ways. First, we have failed to recapitalize the infrastructure we inherited from the insightful people that preceded us to the extent that the corpus value of our capital stock has declined by about \$25 billion since the early '80s. Second, we haven't properly maintained the facilities we have stewardship responsibility for - basically postponing needed maintenance because of resource shortfalls with a result of increasing costs and risks down the road. And, finally, we haven't responded adequately to the increasing pressures and needs brought on by an increasing population and new national priorities.

We have now set a deliberate course to better understand and explain this situation and position the Corps to respond appropriately if national decision-makers decide to address it. Some of these steps include developing a "real" CW Strategic Plan which will be founded on a national needs-based analysis unconstrained by preconceived notions of acceptability, a realistic assessment of necessary (and potentially available) resource levels that will be required to correct the problems and specific guidance directing more open sharing of information with stakeholders. As part of this initiative, we are also contemplating a series of "listening" sessions around the country to gain a better understanding of local and regional needs. In one respect in fact, we've already had the first such session when the Chief recently met with a group of mayors

### IN THIS ISSUE

STEVE'S NOTE .....	1
FRED'S NOTE .....	1
PROGRAM AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM (PROMIS) UPDATE .....	2
PROGRAMS AND PROJECT DELIVERY SYSTEM (PPDS) UPDATE .....	2
PROMISE PHASE PHASE 2 (P2) UPDATE .....	3
A NEW PARTNERSHIP FOR THE CORPS: THE NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION ; CASE STUDY #1: SNAKE RIVER DEMONSTRATION PROJECT, WY; SECOND IN A SERIES .....	3
CIVIL WORKS PROGRAMS EXECUTION NEWS FOR FY 99 ...	4
FORCE PROTECTION AND THE DD FORM 1391 .....	6
ARTICLES OF INTEREST .....	7

from several cities around the U.S. who had requested the meeting to describe their problems and to request Corps assistance. Their stories were very compelling.

All-in-all, the situation we're in is a "once in a career" opportunity. If you haven't heard about these things, ask...and find out what your role is.

I believe this is a very encouraging – perhaps even spectacular way – to begin a new millennium. I hope each one of you has a joyous holiday season and prosperous New Year.

Fred Caver, P.E.  
Chief, Programs Management Division  
Office of Deputy Commanding General  
for Civil Works **S**

## PROGRAM AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM (PROMIS) UPDATE

*MAJ Luke Leonard, CEMP/CW*

The latest releases of PROMIS were issued on 15 and 22 November 1999. These releases contained 45 improvements and repairs to the program. The highlights of this new version are:

1. The new Parent Project Tree is implemented with this release. This changes the way you open your project versions. It sets the stage for on-line program roll-ups within PROMIS which will be possible in Feb 00.
2. Added five new Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) templates:
  - a. Catastrophic Disaster Preparedness Program
  - b. Civil Works Operations and Maintenance
  - c. Civil Works Regulatory
  - d. Flood Plain Management Services
  - e. Planning and Assistance to States
3. You can now select the HTRW Location from the drop down list on the Project Selection Criteria dialog.
4. Now use escalation factor of 1.0 for fully funded calculations for resources with a MOA code of C1 or C2 for contract items that have been awarded.
5. The 2101 report can only be accessed from PROMIS Main. It is disabled in the WBS window.
6. Help files updated to include the Contract Information dialog.
7. New Resource Distribution Estimate dialog. It works the same but is more user-friendly.

The HQ focus over the past several months has been on the upward reporting portion of PROMIS, to produce CMR data. We have developed queries that extract CMR milestone information from all PROMIS projects according to the Command Consolidated Guidance. The districts have been requested to apply specific CMR milestones to each of their applicable projects. HQ has

provided copies of the CMR database to the districts for their use in verifying the accuracy of the data, but *most importantly*, these same reports are available with just a browser through PPDS at the following URL: <http://ppdsintra-w.usace.army.mil/>.

The overseas districts now have their PROMIS databases located on local machines in order to improve the speed of PROMIS. The plan is to continue this effort in the CONUS Districts that are still experiencing network delays which cause PROMIS to run too slow. The corporate database will be maintained by current WES data base administrators, however there are some start up tasks that must be completed by the local district before the database can be established. **S**

## PROGRAMS AND PROJECT DELIVERY SYSTEM (PPDS) UPDATE

*Mr. Bill Stein, CESAD-PM-M*

### Create a Report On-Line

All or selected Project Data Sheets can now be viewed and printed sequentially. This can be a time saver for quickly printing all of a PM's projects, or all projects on a certain installation, etc. To use the function, go to your district, click on military or civil, then at the bottom-left of the page click *Create Report*. Check it out!

### Program Review Boards (PRBS) & Command Management Review (CMR) through PPDS

SAD will conduct their last Military PRB of the millennium using PPDS. PPDS is now capable of collecting 95% of the data used during PRB. The CMR portion of the PPDS website will be used to check the status of FY00 awards, FY01 Ready To Advertise (RTA) and FY02 Project Definitions. The site is designed to show district totals and then it bores down to the project listings and individual projects that are questionable as to meeting the established goals. If you have not checked out this area of PPDS yet, from the first page in PPDS, click on the USACE HQ, then CMR. Follow your way through Military and into your division's projects. This is operational for all Districts and Divisions.

SAD will access their PRB-sensitive projects using the new Create Report feature. Project Data Sheets will be reviewed for schedule and cost information. The PRB will look at the **Issues** area of the Project Data Sheet to obtain the project manager's latest concerns. SAD will note all comments generated at the PRB in the Discussion Database for that individual project. (Discussion Databases for every project are located at the top of the Project Data Sheet for that project in PPDS).

LRD has had two Military PRBs using PPDS and was planning on using it for Civil Works projects. Rock Island District is using the Create Reports feature as their sole source of project information for their district's Civil PRB. CENAD is also developing a procedure to use PPDS for their PRBs.

### Issues, Issues, Issues

The quality of the PROMIS data in PPDS has come a long way and continues to improve. There are two data elements which are often forgotten however. Both are Comments, which are simple text messages in PROMIS. The **Synopsis** comment is a short description of the project which need only be entered once. It tells the person viewing the project in PPDS what the project is all about. The second, and most important are the **Issues**. Issue comments are used to keep the world informed about current project issues. PPDS displays the most recent issue in the project data sheet. This is also where Division and HQ Program Managers will look when they are looking for answers to project concerns. §

## PROMIS PHASE 2 (P2) UPDATE

*Mr. Nelson Cheng, CECW-BA*

**Purpose of the P2 team:** To acquire a commercial-off-the-shelf software which adequately supports and provides structure to the Corps of Engineers programs and project management business process, and provides corporate information for decision support at all levels of the Corps hierarchy. The application should maximize use of the internet.

**Summary of events:** A project team meeting was held on 16-18 November 1999 at the Corps HQ to develop the PM-AIS requirements. Attendees included:

MAJ Luke Leonard	CEMP/CW	PM for PROMIS
Nelson Cheng	CECW	PM for P2
Jitka Braden	CECW	Civil Works
Dewey Bell	CESAS	Military
Peggy Grubbs	CESWF	Military
Gary Rohn	CENAP	Civil Works
Robin Ash	CELRH	Civil Works/ Comp Spec
David Dale	CELRL	Military
Eli Kangas	CESWF	Civil Works
Terri Moody	CEMVD	Civil Works/ Comp Spec
Marcus Clavio	Contractor	

Other Team Members:

Ed Kolodziej	CENWK	Environmental
Moon Yon-Han	CENWD	Environmental

A meeting was held with members of the

Environmental program on 22-24 November 1999 in Kansas City, MO.

The focus of the meeting was developing the operational requirements for the PM-AIS from the Project Delivery Team through to the Headquarters.

1. Project Delivery Team (PDT) - Initiate, Plan, Execute, Reports and Controls
2. District - forecast and assess workload requirements
3. Division (Regional Business Centers) - capability to assess the workload of the Division.
4. Headquarters - provide a corporate view
5. At all levels reports for project management, resource/workload management, performance measures, customers, ad hoc, etc. is a requirement.

Other items of discussion included operational interfaces with other current systems, program specific requirements (Civil and Military), and acquisition strategy.

PRIMAVERA, Inc provided an application demonstration to the team. To date, the team has viewed two possible application solutions (Primavera's P3e and Oracle Projects).

### NEXT STEPS:

15 Jan 00 Complete Baseline Requirements Documents. §

## A NEW PARTNERSHIP FOR THE CORPS:

### THE NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION

#### Case Study #1: Snake River Demonstration Project, WY

#### Second in a Series

*Ms. Cheree Peterson, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, EMAIL: peterson@nfwf.org*

The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (Foundation) is excited by the possibilities of working with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' (Corps) as the Corps fulfills its environmental mission. Since the Corps has a variety of authorities that coincide with the Foundation's mission of conserving fish, wildlife, and plants, the Foundation hopes to support the Corps' restoration work (please see the previous newsletter for background on the Foundation).

One model partnership between the Foundation and the Corps is the Snake River Restoration Demonstration Project. Located near Jackson Hole, Wyoming in Teton County, the Teton County Natural Resource District

(District) contacted the Foundation when the District and Teton County were in the third year of cost-sharing a feasibility study (Jackson Hole Environmental Restoration Study) with the Corps' Walla Walla District to restore riparian and wetland habitats. This area of the Snake River is one of the few remnant strongholds for the native Snake River Finespotted Cutthroat trout, and supports active Bald Eagle and Osprey populations, along with four other endangered species: the gray wolf, grizzly bear, whooping crane, and peregrine falcon.

In the course of the study, the District and the Corps decided it would be highly useful to do a demonstration project to determine the effectiveness of some of the "tools" of the project. These "tools" included debris fences and removal of aggraded bedload materials from the historic river channel; all of which had never been tried in a high velocity riverine environment. The Foundation supplied a \$40,000 grant to construct the demonstration project, which the District matched with \$50,000 in funds and in-kind services. The Corps provided oversight of construction, survey work, and technical assistance to the District.

As a result of the project, the District and the Corps determined which "tools" performed well and which "tools" needed improvement. The Corps incorporated the results into the draft feasibility study. Without Foundation support, the District believes the demonstration project would not have occurred, which could have decreased the effectiveness of the overall project.

This successful partnership between the Foundation and the Corps represents one wonderful model for effective partnership between the Foundation and the Corps. I encourage Corps staff to contact the Foundation in situations where demonstration projects will result in an improved feasibility study. In certain instances, the Foundation may also give grants to support the local cost-share of a Corps' project, which will be the subject of the next case study. **S**

---

## **CIVIL WORKS PROGRAMS EXECUTION NEWS FOR FY 99**

### **Overall Execution**

*Ms. Wanda Cook, CECW-BD*

Overall execution for FY 1999 was 97.2 percent, or \$4.49 billion actual versus scheduled expenditures. Although we ended this fiscal year with an AMBER rating, we also raised the bar for measurement during the year; the 97.2 percent rating would have been green against last years rating criteria. Even though our goal of expending \$4.6 billion did not transpire, this year's execution did exceed FY 98 performance by about \$390 million and reduced the carryover by about \$200

million. The MSC's, districts and centers are commended for a record year; however, we are looking to you for a banner year in FY 2000.

The 2101 schedules of expenditures and obligations database was locked on 25 October. Again this year, we have asked that you not only grow the program in total, but also strive to get a faster start in the first quarter. The first quarter "charge" was directed from the Chief and we urge you to make your best efforts for an extraordinary 1st quarter execution. Please forward any obstacles that can be elevated to the HQ for resolution in order to keep execution on track.

The DCGCW is interested in getting off to the earliest and quickest start possible on FY 2001 schedules. You should be expecting the initial guidance memorandum for FY 2001 schedules of obligations and expenditures in early December. Just as we did this year, we will be locking the first quarter schedules on 1 October 2000.

Congratulations to everyone in USACE for your hard work and dedication to excellence that it took for us to achieve these and the individual program results described below.

### **General Investigations**

*Mr. Ken Hall, CECW-BW*

We completed FY 1999 with expenditures of \$165.7M. This equates to 95% of scheduled, an AMBER rating. While we didn't measure up to a FY 1999 GREEN expenditure execution rating, most MSC's and FOA's reflected an enhanced execution performance and should be patting themselves on the back. One aspect of success is that the FY 1999 expenditures were the greatest since FY 1995. While this is not a rating factor reflected by the execution charts, it is an important element for growing the program.

Part of this success can be attributed to the early fessups of excess funds. These early fessups enabled the timely reprogramming actions to happen early in the fiscal year so that those who could effectively utilize the funds, received them. These actions reflect the corporate Corps attitude critical for growing the program and are successes even though they are not as easily measured and do not receive an execution rating. However, remember the real objective is to - DEVELOP YOUR NEEDS, BUDGET WHAT YOU NEED AND UTILIZE WHAT YOU GET.

### **Construction, General (CG)**

*Mr. Steve Hudak, CECW-BE*

FY 1999 CG expenditure performance is rated RED and FY 1999 CAP expenditure performance is rated AMBER. Nevertheless, FY 1999 CG and CAP



expenditure performance exceeded FY 1998 performance by \$191 million and \$28 million, respectively.

Scheduled FY 1999 CG expenditures total \$1.537 billion. CG expenditure performance for FY99 is \$1.432 billion, which is 93.2 percent of the scheduled amount. This is 6.8 percent below the goal of expending 100 percent of scheduled expenditures and results in a RED rating for FY 1999. However, this is \$191 million more than actual FY 1998 expenditures of \$1.241 billion.

Scheduled FY 1999 CAP expenditures total \$104 million. CAP expenditure performance for FY 1999 is \$99 million, which is 95.2 percent of the scheduled amount. This is 4.8 percent below the goal of expending 100 percent of scheduled expenditures and results in an AMBER rating for FY 1999. However, this is \$28 million more than actual FY 1998 expenditures of \$71 million.

Notwithstanding the RED and AMBER ratings, FY 1999 CG and CAP expenditure performance exceeded FY 1998 performance by 15 percent and 39 percent, respectively, and provides a good start for growing the Corps program. Scheduled FY 2000 CG and CAP expenditures total \$1.615 billion and \$103 million, respectively, and will provide further opportunities to grow the program.

#### **Mississippi River And Tributaries (MR&T)**

*Mr. Kyle Jones, CECW-BC*

Good News for FY 99 Execution!!!! The Mississippi Valley Division is to be congratulated for attaining an overall FY 1999 MR&T execution rate of 99.5 percent, which earned them a GREEN rating. This level of performance required substantial effort by all organizational elements, both division and district, due to the complexity of the program. All USACE team members in MVD can take justifiable pride in a job well done.

#### **Operation And Maintenance, General (O&M)**

*Mr. Joseph Bittner, CECW-BC*

You did it! The 98.2 percent expenditure rate for FY 1999 is not only GREEN, but a record high, based on data going back to FY 1981. The unexpended balance is also a record low at \$36 million. This record breaking performance has been recognized by our examiners at OMB and it certainly goes a long way toward making the case to grow the O&M program.

In reading pre-PRB comments from the various MSC's throughout the year, I noticed that the best performers were the ones that showed a strong personal interest by the Commanders. Good staff action at the District level is also essential, but an alert manager at

the MSC level is needed to spot opportunities for revoking slippage's and reprogramming funds elsewhere to help address the backlog and get full utilization of our limited resources.

Now that MSC's have almost unlimited reprogramming authority the job should be much easier. But, be careful, any hint of slipshod allocations could result in a withdrawal of the delegated authority. The CECW-B Area Managers are ready, willing and able to help in any sticky situations. One team!

#### **Formerly Utilized Site Remedial Action Program**

*Mr. Hans Moennig, CECW-BA*

Under the Formerly Utilized Site Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP), the Corps expended 101% of the scheduled funds for FY 1999. This extraordinary performance is the result of effective and efficient program execution and receiving additional funds through potential responsible party (PRP) contributions.

The Corps completed clean-up activities at two sites reducing the number of sites to clean up to 19. In the two years since the Corps began executing the program, over 320,000 CY of contaminated material has been remediated. Additionally, the Corps awarded three significant contracts in fiscal year 1999, site specific environmental restoration contracts for \$300-million and \$50-million, respectively, for the Maywood and Wayne sites in New Jersey and a \$400-million multiple award national disposal contract.

Thanks to all the Corps team members who have been contributing to this very important program. You can take justifiable pride in a job well done. We look forward to continued exceptional effort leading to further successes in FY 2000!!

#### **Project Deauthorization Update**

*Mr. John Micik, CECW-BA*

In accordance with 33 USC 579a(b)(2), the ASA(CW) submitted to Congress on 15 October 1999, the biennial list of authorized, unconstructed projects, and separable elements of projects, on which obligations have not been incurred for the last seven fiscal years. By law, the projects will be deauthorized on 16 April 2002 unless Federal funds are obligated for planning, design or construction.

The law also requires that affected Congressional delegations must be notified of projects on the list. Instructions were sent to Division and District commanders in CECW-BA memorandum, 28 October 1999, Notification of U.S. Senators and Members of the House of Representatives Regarding Projects That Are Eligible for Deauthorization. Please note that the deauthorization date stated in the memorandum was corrected on 5 November 1999 to read "16 April 2002."

The dispositions of previously-submitted project lists were published in the Federal Register on 13 October 1999 (pages 55459-62) and 25 October 1999 (pages 57515-17). Project reauthorizations also were included in these Federal Register notices. §

---

## FORCE PROTECTION AND THE DD FORM 1391

*Mr. Daniel L. Sommer, CENWO-ED-S*  
*Mr. Douglas E. Wehring, CENWO-ED-S*

Ever since the terrorist bombing of Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia the Department of Defense has been especially concerned about ensuring something like that doesn't happen again. That concern has manifested itself in new requirements for incorporating "Antiterrorism/Force Protection" (AT/FP) measures into all military construction and reflecting the costs for those measures in DD forms 1391 that are sent to Congress. These requirements are going to affect the design of military facilities, so you need to be familiar with them. Furthermore, understanding the requirements is critical so that you can work with your customers to ensure they are incorporated.

The new requirements come from three major sources. The first is Army Regulation 525-13, Antiterrorism Force Protection: Security of Personnel, Information, and Critical Resources. That regulation requires that force protection be considered in standard Army design practice with security measures based on risk and threat analysis. This obviously applies specifically to your Army customers.

The second source of requirements is actually a series of sources. They are AT/FP Construction Standards. There are several of them that are either already in force or are in development. There are separate standards for each of the areas of responsibility for the geographic Commanders in Chief (Central Command, European Command, Southern Command, and Pacific Command.) In addition, various service elements of those commands have established their own standards. The standards specific to particular geographic regions are already in place. There is also a DoD AT/FP Construction Standard that is going to be signed very soon. It will apply to all Military Construction projects from the Fiscal Year 2002 program and beyond. It will establish some minimum construction standards for all inhabited structures which will add between 1/2% and 1% to the primary facility cost for those structures. You need to get familiar with whichever of these standards apply to your customers as soon as possible.

The third source of requirements is another Army Regulation (AR 415-15, Army Military Construction Program Development and Execution.) That regulation

also requires that AT/FP be made part of standard design practice and that protective measures be based on risk and threat analysis in accordance with Technical Manual 5-853-1/AFMAN 32-1071, Volume 1, Security Engineering Project Development. Furthermore, it requires signatures on the DD Form 1391 that AT/FP has been considered. DoD FMR, Part 7000.14R, "DoD Financial Management Regulation", further states that all DD Forms 1391 must have AT/FP costs annotated for both the primary and supporting facilities on the front page.

So, what does all this mean? Mainly, it means that AT/FP is just another requirement we all have to consider and that it is here to stay. The ACSIM is mandating that the DoD AT/FP Construction Standard be implemented and has established specific requirements for what must be reflected on DD form 1391.

Recent ACSIM guidance clarifies what is already in the DD Form 1391 Processor for inclusion in Section 22 of the 1391. It includes the three possible statements that can apply for every project. Those statements reflect whether or not the risk and threat analysis has been done and whether any protective measures need to be incorporated to mitigate the vulnerabilities associated with those threats. It also clarifies that the installation Provost Marshal, the Director of Public Works, and the installation Force Protection Officer have to sign off on those statements to certify that AT/FP has been considered.

The ACSIM guidance also requires that Block 22 include, among other things, a summary of the risk and threat analysis results, a detailed description of what construction features are required to mitigate those threats, and an estimate of the cost of those measures.

This all requires significant effort on the part of the installations that develop the DD Forms 1391. It also requires significant effort by the Corps of Engineers to ensure that those requirements are properly reflected in those documents and that the design Districts implement the requirements in their designs. It may also represent an opportunity for you to provide additional services to your customers, however.

There is help available. The Corps of Engineers Protective Design Center in the Omaha District reviews the 1391s. We will be looking for the things the ACSIM requires to be in them. Additionally, descriptions and items in other sections of the 1391 are reviewed for AT/FP information or equipment that might have been overlooked or not included in Section 22. Section 12 deals with criteria for construction. This section is scanned for security guidelines that might have been omitted and occasionally a criteria document is suggested for inclusion. Section 7 Justification, Section 8 Present Accommodations and Dispositions, and Section 13 Furniture and Equipment are checked for items that could be security related. Section 14 Special

Design Instructions, Section 23 Additional Requirements, and Section 24 Miscellaneous are reviewed for any security or AT/FP issues that might be addressed. We will contact the Corps Divisions when we find problems.

The Protective Design Center is also available to provide general assistance in unraveling these mysteries and we provide training. You can contact us by calling Daniel L. Sommer at (402) 221-3151 or Douglas E. Wehring at (402) 221-4918 or by E-mailing either of us. **S**

## ARTICLES OF INTEREST

Other article(s) that may be of interest to you:

1. From the magazine, "PM Network", Sept. 1999. Located at the following URL: <http://www.pmi.org/publictn/pmnetworkonline>

- a. "Training and Development Linked to Competitiveness", edited by Joanita Nellenbach.
- b. "Don't Shoot the Escalator", by Fred Erman.
- c. "Thanks Josh", by Bud Baker.
- d. "Duties of the Effective Project Manager", by Neal Whitten.
- e. "The First Step Can Be the Most Important", by Joan Knutson.
- f. "Project Management Meets Marketing and Sales", by Phillip Diab.
- g. "The Evolution of Project Management at GSA", by Al DeLucia.
- h. "Computerized Management Systems", by Michael Hatfield.

2. From the magazine "Project Management Journal" for September 1999.

- a. "Cross-Functional Project Teams in Functionally Aligned Organizations", by Suzanne Bishop.

**This publication is located at the following URLs:**  
<http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/functions/cw/cecwb/naws> or  
<http://www.hq.usace.army.mil/comp/w/mr/nwsltr/nwinDX.htm>

**YOU MAY CONTRIBUTE ARTICLES OR PROVIDE SUGGESTIONS FOR ARTICLES TO EITHER:**

**MR. EDWARD P. RACHT, CEMP-MP, 202-761-8816  
 OR MR. BRAD PRICE, CECW-BD, 202-761-1116.**

*Programs Management News* is an unofficial publication published in accordance with AR 25-30, The Army Integrated Publishing and Printing Program. It is published by the HQ, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Office of Deputy Commanding General for Civil Works and Office of Deputy Commanding General for Military Programs, Programs Management Division, 20 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington D.C., 20314-1000. **S**

- b. "An Assessment of Post-Project Reviews", by J.S. Busby.
- c. "Requirements for an Effective Project Risk Management Process", by Stephen Ward.
- d. "Improving Resource-Constrained Project Schedules With Look-Ahead Techniques", by Douglas Gemmill and Michelle Edwards.

3. From the magazine "PM Network" for Oct. 1999. Located at the following URL: <http://www.pmi.org/publictn/pmnetworkonline>

- a. "The S-Shape Curve", by Neal Whitten.
- b. "Why Chris Can't Estimate", by William Duncan.
- c. "Reaching Consensus", by Paula Martin and Karen Tate.
- d. "Shared Contingency: Exploring the Critical Chain", by Harvey Levine.
- e. "Gathering and Using Lessons Learned", by Adrian Abramovici.
- f. "Maintaining market Leadership Through Learning", by Rochelle Rucker.
- g. "Project Communication Management: Five Steps", by Michael Terrell.
- h. "Project or Program Management", by Mark Becker.

4. From the magazine "PM Network" for Nov. 1999. Located at the following URL: <http://www.pmi.org/publictn/pmnetworkonline>

- a. "Corporate Emphasis On Project Management, But Problems Remain", by Joanita Nellenbach.
- b. "Adding ICES To Your Brainstorming", by Fred Erman.
- c. "Walking The Talk", by John Sullivan.
- d. "All Project Members Should Be Treated Equal", by Neal Whitten.
- e. "Mentoring: A Key To Employee Loyalty", by Chip Bell.
- f. "You Owe Your Project Players A Communication Infrastructure - Part 1", by Joan Knutson. **S**

## CONTRIBUTORS

MR. JOSEPH BITTNER .....	CECW-BC
MR. STEVE BROWNING .....	CEMP-M
MR. FRED CAVER .....	CECW-B
MR. NELSON CHENG .....	CECW-BA
MS. WANDA COOK .....	CECW-BD
MR. KEN HALL.....	CECW-BW
MR. STEVE HUDAK .....	CECW-BE
MR. KYLE JONES .....	CECW-BC
MAJ LUKE LEONARD .....	CEMP/CW
MR. JOHN MICIK .....	CECW-BA
MR. HANS MOENNIG .....	CECW-BA
MS. CHEREE PETERSON .....	NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION
MR. DANIEL L. SOMMER .....	CENWO-ED-S
MR. BILL STEIN .....	CESAD-PM-M
MR. DOUGLAS E. WEHRING .....	CENWO-ED-S